

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **02 March 2010**, the Examiner reviewed claims 64-87. Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Examiner objected to claim 66 because of informalities. Examiner rejected claims 64-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner stated that claims 64-87 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Specification and Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the independent claims rendering the objection to the specification moot. Applicant has also corrected the typographical error in claims 66, 74, and 82. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims overcome the objections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected 64-87 claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Examiner objects to the limitation “a hardware configuration identifier modification date stored on the server” as being indefinite because there is no indication of any modification dates being stored on the server. Applicant has amended the claim language to clarify *retrieving a modification date for the previously stored hardware configuration identifier*. This finds support in ¶¶[0042]-[0043] of the instant application. Examiner objects to the term “sufficient” as rendering claims 66, 70, 74, 82, and 86 indefinite. Applicant has amended the claim language to delete the term. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the claims definite.

Examiner notes in the Office Action that claims 64-87 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the above rejections. Applicant has amended the independent claims. These amendments find support in ¶¶[0042]-[0043] of the instant application. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the rejections. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 64, 68, 72, 76, 80, and 84 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 65-67, which depend upon claim 64, claims 69-71, which depend upon claim 68, claims 73-75, which depend upon claim 72, claims 77-79, which depend upon claim 76, claims 81-83, which depend upon claim 80, and claim 85-87, which depends upon claim 84, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 30 April 2010

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com